arXiv:math/0002067v1 [math.CA] 9 Feb 2000

Fuglede's conjecture for a union of two intervals

I. Łaba
Department of Mathematics
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544
U.S.A.
laba@math.princeton.edu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We prove that a union of two intervals in $\mathbf{R}$ is a spectral set if and only if it tiles $\mathbf{R}$ by translations. Mathematics Subject Classification: 42A99.

1 The results

A Borel set $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ of positive measure is said to *tile* $\mathbf{R}^n$ *by translations* if there is a discrete set $T \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ such that, up to sets of measure 0, the sets $\Omega + t,\ t \in T$, are disjoint and $\bigcup_{t\in T}(\Omega + t) = \mathbf{R}^n$. We may rescale Ω so that $|\Omega| = 1$. We say that $\Lambda = \{\lambda_k :\ k \in \mathbf{Z}\} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a *spectrum* for Ω if:

$$\{e^{2\pi i\lambda_k\cdot x}\}_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} \text{ is an orthonormal basis for } L^2(\Omega). \tag{1.1}$$

A *spectral set* is a domain $\Omega \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that (1.1) holds for some Λ.

Fuglede [2] conjectured that a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a spectral set if and only if it tiles $\mathbf{R}^n$ by translations, and proved this conjecture under the assumption that either Λ or T is a lattice. The conjecture is related to the question of the existence of commuting self-adjoint extensions of the operators $-i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ [2], [7], [16]; other relations between the tiling and spectral properties of subsets of $\mathbf{R}^n$ have been conjectured and in some cases proved, see [6], [8], [9], [11], [12], [14].

Recently there has been significant progress on the special case of the conjecture when Ω is assumed to be convex [10], [3], [4], and in particular the 2-dimensional convex case appears to be nearly resolved [5]. The non-convex case is considerably more complicated and is not understood even in dimension 1. The strongest results yet in that direction seem to be those of Lagarias and Wang [13], [14], who proved that all tilings of $\mathbf{R}$ by a bounded region must be periodic and that the corresponding translation sets are rational up to affine transformations, which in turn leads to a structure theorem for bounded tiles. It was also observed in [14] that the "tiling implies spectrum" part of Fuglede's conjecture for compact sets in $\mathbf{R}$ would follow from a conjecture of Tijdeman [18] concerning factorization of finite cyclic groups; however, Tijdeman's conjecture is now known to fail without additional assumptions [1]. See also [15], [1] for partial results on the related problem of characterizing all tilings of $\mathbf{Z}$ by a finite set, and [14], [17] for a classification of domains in $\mathbf{R}^n$ which have $L+\mathbf{Z}^n$ as a spectrum for some finite set L.

The purpose of the present article is to address the following special case of Fuglede's conjecture in one dimension. Let $\Omega = I_1 \cup I_2$, where I_1, I_2 are disjoint intervals of non-zero length. By scaling, translation, and symmetric reflection, we may assume that:

$$\Omega = (0,r) \cup (a, a+1-r),\ 0 < r \leq \frac{1}{2},\ a \geq r. \tag{1.2}$$

Our first theorem characterizes all Ω's of the form (1.2) which are spectral sets.

Theorem 1.1 *Suppose that Λ is a spectrum for Ω, $0 \in \Lambda$. Then at least one of the following holds:*

(i) $a-r \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\Lambda = \mathbf{Z}$;

(ii) $r=\frac{1}{2}$, $a=\frac{n}{2}$ for some $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, and $\Lambda = 2\mathbf{Z} \bigcup (\frac{p}{n}+2\mathbf{Z})$ for some odd integer p.

Conversely, if Ω, Λ satisfy (1.2) and if either (i) or (ii) holds, then Λ is a spectrum for Ω.

As a corollary, we prove that Fuglede's conjecture is true for a union of two intervals.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}$ be a union of two disjoint intervals, $|\Omega| = 1$. Then Ω has a spectrum if and only if it tiles $\mathbf{R}$ by translations.*

Theorem 1.2 follows easily from Theorem 1.1. We may assume that Ω is as in (1.2). Suppose that Λ is a spectrum for Ω; without loss of generality we may assume that $0 \in \Lambda$. Then by Theorem 1.1 one of the conclusions *(i), (ii)* must hold, and in each of these cases Ω tiles $\mathbf{R}$ by translations. Conversely, if Ω tiles $\mathbf{R}$ by translations, by Proposition 2.1 Ω must satisfy Theorem 1.1*(i)* or *(ii)*; the second part of Theorem 1.1 implies then that Ω has a spectrum.

Theorem 1.1 will be proved as follows. Suppose that $\Lambda = \{\lambda_k :\ k \in \mathbf{Z}\}$is a spectrum for Ω; we may assume that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Let $\lambda_{kk'} = \lambda_k - \lambda_{k'}$, $\Lambda - \Lambda = \{\lambda_{kk'} :\ k, k' \in \mathbf{Z}\}$, and:

$$Z_\Omega = \{0\} \cup \{\lambda \in \mathbf{R} :\ \hat{\chi}_\Omega(\lambda) = 0\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then the functions $e^{2\pi i \lambda_k x}$ are mutually orthogonal in $L^2(\Omega)$, hence $\Lambda \subset \Lambda - \Lambda \subset Z_\Omega$. This will lead to a number of restrictions on the possible values of λ_k. Next, let:

$$\phi_\lambda(x) = \chi_{(0,r)} e^{2\pi i \lambda x}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\chi_{(0,r)}$ denotes the characteristic function of $(0,r)$. By Parseval's formula, the Fourier coefficients $c_k = \int_0^r e^{2\pi i(\lambda - \lambda_k)x} dx$ of ϕ_λ satisfy:

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} c_k^2 = \|\chi_{(0,r)} e^{2\pi i \lambda x}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = r. \tag{1.5}$$

Given that the λ_k's are subject to the orthogonality restrictions mentioned above, we will find that there are not enough λ_k's for (1.5) to hold unless the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied.

The author is grateful to Alex Iosevich for helpful conversations about spectral sets and Fuglede's conjecture.

2 Tiling implies spectrum

Proposition 2.1 *If* Ω *as in (1.2) tiles* $\mathbf{R}$ *by translations, it must satisfy (i) or (ii) of Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{R}$ may be tiled by translates of Ω. Assume first that $r = \frac{1}{2}$. Any copy of Ω used in the tiling has a "gap" of length $a - r = a - \frac{1}{2}$, which must be covered by non-overlapping intervals of length $\frac{1}{2}$; hence $a \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}$ as in Theorem 1.1*(ii)*.

Assume now that $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$. Let $I_1 = (0, r)$, $I_2 = (a, a+1-r)$. We will prove that translates of I_1 and I_2 must alternate in any tiling $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathbf{R}$ by translates of Ω; this implies immediately that $a - r \in \mathbf{Z}$ as in Theorem 1.1*(i)*.

- If $\mathcal{T}$ contained two consecutive translates $(\tau, \tau + r)$ and $(\tau + r, \tau + 2r)$ of I_1, it would also contain the matching translates $(\tau + a, \tau + a + 1 - r)$ and $(\tau + a + r, \tau + a + 1)$ of I_2, which is impossible since the latter two intervals overlap.
- Suppose now that $\mathcal{T}$ contains two consecutive translates $(\tau + a, \tau + a + 1 - r)$ and $(\tau + a + 1 - r, \tau + a + 2 - 2r)$ of I_2; then $\mathcal{T}$ must also contain the matching translates $I_1' = (\tau, \tau + r)$ and $I_1'' = (\tau + 1 - r, \tau + 2 - 2r)$ of I_1. The gap between I_1' and I_1'' has length $1 - 2r$, which is strictly less than $1 - r = |I_2|$, so that I_1' must be followed by another translate of I_1. But this has just been shown to be impossible. □

Next, we prove the second part of Theorem 1.1. This easy result appears to have been known to several authors, see e.g., the examples in [2], [8], [14]. Since we will rely on it later on in the proof of the "hard" part of the theorem, we include the short proof.

Proposition 2.2 *If* Λ *and* Ω *are as in Theorem 1.1(i) or (ii), then* Λ *is a spectrum for* Ω.

Proof. If *(i)* holds, then Ω is a fundamental domain for $\mathbf{Z}$ and consequently $\Lambda = \mathbf{Z}$ is a spectrum [2]. Suppose now that *(ii)* holds. For any function f on Ω, we define functions f_+, f_-:

$$f_+(x) = \frac{1}{2}(f(x) + f(x')),\ f_-(x) = \frac{1}{2}(f(x) - f(x')),\ x \in \Omega,$$

where $x' = x + a$ if $x \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $x' = x - a$ if $x \in (a, a + \frac{1}{2})$. Then:

$$f(x) = f_+(x) + f_-(x),\ f_+(x) = f_+(x'),\ f_-(x) = -f_-(x').$$

It therefore suffices to prove that:

$$g(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} c_k e^{4k\pi i x} \text{ for any } g(x) \text{ such that } g(x) = g(x'), \tag{2.1}$$

$$h(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} c_k' e^{(4k + \frac{2p}{n})\pi i x} \text{ for any } h(x) \text{ such that } h(x) = -h(x'). \tag{2.2}$$

Since $e^{4k\pi ix}$, $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, is a spectrum for $(0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have:

$$g(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} c_k e^{4k\pi ix},\ h(x) = e^{\frac{2p}{n}\pi ix} \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} c'_k e^{4k\pi ix},\ x \in (0, \frac{1}{2}).$$

(2.1) follows immediately by periodicity. From the second equation above we find that (2.2) holds for all $x \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and that for such x:

$$e^{\frac{2p}{n}\pi i(x+a)} \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} c'_k e^{4k\pi i(x+a)} = -e^{\frac{2p}{n}\pi ix} \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} c'_k e^{4k\pi ix} = -h(x) = h(x+a),$$

where we used that $\frac{2p}{n}a = p$ is odd. Hence (2.2) holds also for $x \in (a, a + \frac{1}{2})$. This ends the proof of Proposition 2.2. $\square$

3 Orthogonality

We now begin the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.1. Throughout the rest of the paper, Ω is assumed to satisfy (1.2), $\Lambda = \{\lambda_k :\ k \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ is a spectrum for Ω, $\lambda_0 = 0$, $\lambda_{kk'} = \lambda_k - \lambda_{k'}$, $\Lambda - \Lambda = \{\lambda_{kk'} :\ k, k' \in \mathbf{Z}\}$, and Z_Ω is defined by (1.3).

Lemma 3.1 *$Z_\Omega = Z_1 \cup Z_2 \cup Z_3$, where:*

$$Z_1 = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{R} :\ \lambda a \in \mathbf{Z} + \tfrac{1}{2},\ \lambda(2r-1) \in \mathbf{Z}\},$$
$$Z_2 = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{Z} :\ \lambda r \in \mathbf{Z}\},$$
$$Z_3 = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{Z} :\ \lambda(a-r) \in \mathbf{Z}\}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\lambda \neq 0$, $\lambda \in Z_\Omega$. Then:

$$\int_\Omega e^{2\pi i\lambda x} dx = e^{2\pi i\lambda r} - 1 + e^{2\pi i\lambda(a+1-r)} - e^{2\pi i\lambda a} = 0.$$

All solutions to $z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + 1 = 0$, $|z_i| = 1$, must be of the form $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\} = \{-1, z_*, -z_*\}$. Hence $\lambda \in Z_\Omega$ if and only if one of the following holds.

- $e^{2\pi i\lambda a} = -1$ and $e^{2\pi i\lambda r} + e^{2\pi i\lambda(a+1-r)} = 0$, hence $\lambda \in Z_1$;
- $e^{2\pi i\lambda r} = 1$ and $e^{2\pi i\lambda(1-r)} = 1$, hence $\lambda \in Z_2$;
- $e^{2\pi i\lambda(a+1-r)} = 1$ and $e^{2\pi i\lambda a} = e^{2\pi i\lambda r}$, hence $\lambda \in Z_3$. $\square$

Observe that Z_2, Z_3 are additive subgroups of $\mathbf{Z}$.

Lemma 3.2 *At least one of the following holds:*

$$\Lambda \subset Z_1 \cup Z_2, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\Lambda \subset Z_1 \cup Z_3. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, $\Lambda \subset \Lambda - \Lambda \subset Z_\Omega \subset Z_1 \cup Z_2 \cup Z_3$. If $Z_2 \subset Z_3$, (3.2) holds; suppose therefore that there is a $\lambda_i \in Z_2 \setminus Z_3$. It suffices to prove that for any $\lambda_j \in Z_3$ we must have $\lambda_j \in Z_1$ or $\lambda_j \in Z_2$.

Let $\lambda_j \in Z_3$, then $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_i - \lambda_j \in Z_\Omega$ by orthogonality. By Lemma 3.1, $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_1 \cup Z_2 \cup Z_3$. If $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_2$, then $\lambda_j \in Z_2$ and we are done, and if $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_3$, then $\lambda_i \in Z_3$, which contradicts our assumption. Assume therefore that $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_1$. Then:

$$\lambda_{ij} \in \mathbf{Z},\ \lambda_{ij} a \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2},\ \lambda_{ij}(2r-1) \in \mathbf{Z},$$

hence:

$$2\lambda_j r = 2\lambda_i r - \lambda_{ij}(2r-1) - \lambda_{ij} \in \mathbf{Z}.$$

If $\lambda_j r \in \mathbf{Z}$, then $\lambda_j \in Z_2$; if $\lambda_j r \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, then $\lambda_j a \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$ by the definition of Z_3 and $\lambda_j(2r-1) \in \mathbf{Z}$, so that $\lambda_j \in Z_1$. □

Lemma 3.3 *(i)* $\Lambda \subset Z_2$ *is not possible;*
(ii) $\Lambda \subset Z_3$ *is possible only if* $a - r \in \mathbf{Z}$ *and* $\Lambda = Z_3 = \mathbf{Z}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\Lambda \subset Z_i$ for $i = 2$ or 3. Since Z_i is an additive subgroup of $\mathbf{Z}$, we must have $Z_i = p\mathbf{Z}$ for some integer $p > 0$. Furthermore, if there was a $\lambda \in p\mathbf{Z} \setminus \Lambda$, we would have $\lambda_k - \lambda \in p\mathbf{Z}$ and hence $e^{2\pi i\lambda x}$ would be orthogonal to $e^{2\pi i\lambda_k x}$ for all $\lambda_k \in \Lambda$, which would contradict (1.1). Hence $\Lambda = Z_i = p\mathbf{Z}$. We also observe that if p was ≥ 2, any function of the form $f(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} c_k e^{2\pi i\lambda_k x}$ would be periodic with period $\frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, which again would contradict (1.1). Thus $\Lambda = Z_i = \mathbf{Z}$.

If $i = 2$, this is not possible, since nr cannot be integer for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ if $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$. If $i = 3$, we obtain that $n(a-r) \in \mathbf{Z}$ for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$; letting $n = 1$, we find that $a - r \in \mathbf{Z}$. □

If Ω, Λ are as in Lemma 3.3*(ii)*, then Theorem 1.1*(i)* is satisfied and we are done. Thus we may assume throughout the sequel that:

$$\Lambda \not\subset Z_2,\ \Lambda \not\subset Z_3. \tag{3.3}$$

Lemma 3.4 *If (3.3) holds, then* $\Lambda \subset Z_1 \cup (Z_2 \cap Z_3)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2), it suffices to prove that:

$$\text{if } \Lambda \cap (Z_1 \setminus Z_2) \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } \Lambda \cap Z_2 \subset \Lambda \cap Z_3; \tag{3.4}$$

$$\text{if } \Lambda \cap (Z_1 \setminus Z_3) \neq \emptyset, \text{ then } \Lambda \cap Z_3 \subset \Lambda \cap Z_2; \tag{3.5}$$

We will prove (3.4); the proof of (3.5) is almost identical. Suppose that $\lambda_i \in Z_1 \setminus Z_2$, and let $\lambda_j \in Z_2$. By Lemma 3.1, λ_{ij} belongs to at least one of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3; moreover, $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_2$ would imply $\lambda_i \in Z_2$ and contradict the above supposition. Thus we only need consider the following two cases.

- Let $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_1$. Then $\lambda_i a, \lambda_{ij} a \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, hence $\lambda_j a \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\lambda_j \in Z_2 \cap Z_3$.

- Assume now that $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_3$. Then $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{Z}$, hence $2\lambda_i r \in \mathbf{Z}$. We cannot have $\lambda_i r \in \mathbf{Z}$, since then λ_i would be in Z_2; therefore $\lambda_i r \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $\lambda_i(a-r) \in \mathbf{Z}$; since also $\lambda_{ij}(a-r) \in \mathbf{Z}$, we obtain that $\lambda_j(a-r) \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\lambda_j \in Z_2 \cap Z_3$. □.

Lemma 3.5 *Assume (3.3). Then:*
(i) $\Lambda - \Lambda \subset Z_1 \cup (Z_2 \cap Z_3)$*;*
(ii) $\Lambda \cap Z_1 \subset \lambda_* + r^{-1}\mathbf{Z}$ *for some* $\lambda_* \in \mathbf{R}$.

Proof. For $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, let $\Lambda_k = \Lambda - \lambda_k = \{\lambda_{jk} : \ j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$. Then Λ_k is also a spectrum for Ω and $0 \in \Lambda_k$, hence all of the results obtained so far apply with Λ replaced by Λ_k. Thus *(i)* follows from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4.

To prove *(ii)*, it suffices to verify that $\lambda_{ij} r \in \mathbf{Z}$ whenever $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in Z_1$. Indeed, if $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in Z_1$, then $\lambda_{ij} a \in \mathbf{Z}$, hence $\lambda_{ij} \notin Z_1$ and therefore, by *(i)*, $\lambda_{ij} \in Z_2 \cap Z_3$. But this implies that $\lambda_{ij} r \in \mathbf{Z}$. □

4 Completeness

Fix $j, n \in \mathbf{Z}$, and consider the function ϕ_λ defined by (1.4) with $\lambda = \lambda_j - nr^{-1}$. The Fourier coefficients of ϕ_λ are:

$$c_k = \int_0^r e^{2\pi i(\lambda - \lambda_k)x} dx = \int_0^r e^{2\pi i(\lambda_{jk} - nr^{-1})x} dx,$$

hence $c_k = r$ if $\lambda_{jk} = nr^{-1}$, and:

$$c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i(\lambda_{jk} - nr^{-1})}\Big(e^{2\pi i(\lambda_{jk} r - n)} - 1\Big), \ \lambda_{jk} \neq nr^{-1}. \tag{4.1}$$

Define $\alpha_{jk} = \lambda_{jk} r$. Plugging (4.1) into (1.5), we obtain that for all $j \in \mathbf{Z}$:

$$\frac{1}{r} = 1 + \sum_{k : \alpha_{jk} \notin \mathbf{Z}} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \alpha_{jk}^2} \Big| e^{2\pi i \alpha_{jk}} - 1 \Big|^2, \tag{4.2}$$

and for all $n, j \in \mathbf{Z}$:

$$\frac{1}{r} = \delta_{n,j} + \sum_{k : \alpha_{jk} \notin \mathbf{Z}} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 (\alpha_{jk} - n)^2} \Big| e^{2\pi i(\alpha_{jk} - n)} - 1 \Big|^2, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\delta_{n,j} = 1$ if there is a $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $\alpha_{jk} = n$, and $\delta_{n,j} = 0$ otherwise.

We define the equivalence relation between the indices k, k':

$$k \sim k' \ \Leftrightarrow \ \ \alpha_{kk'} \in \mathbf{Z},$$

and denote by $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m, \ldots \subset \mathbf{Z}$ the (non-empty and disjoint) equivalence classes with respect to this relation. Hence k, k' belong to the same A_m if and only if $\alpha_{kk'} \in \mathbf{Z}$; in particular, $A_m \subset \beta_m + \mathbf{Z}$ for some $\beta_m \in [0, 1)$.

Lemma 4.1 *Let M denote the number of distinct and non-empty A_m's. Then:*

$$M \geq r^{-1}. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, if one of the A_m's skips a number (i.e., $A_m \neq \beta_m + \mathbf{Z}$), then $M \geq r^{-1} + 1$.

Proof. For each m, m', let $\beta_{mm'} = \beta_m - \beta_{m'}$; note that $\beta_{mm'} \neq 0$ if $m \neq m'$. Fix m' and $j \in A_{m'}$, then (4.2) may be rewritten as:

$$\frac{1}{r} = 1 + \sum_{m \neq m'} S_{mm'}, \tag{4.5}$$

where:

$$S_{mm'} = \sum_{k \in A_m} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \alpha_{jk}^2} \left| e^{2\pi i \beta_{mm'}} - 1 \right|^2.$$

Clearly:

$$S_{mm'} \leq \tilde{S}(\beta_{mm'}), \tag{4.6}$$

where:

$$\tilde{S}(\beta) = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 (\beta + k)^2} \left| e^{2\pi i \beta} - 1 \right|^2. \tag{4.7}$$

Hence (4.4) follows from (4.5) and Lemma 4.2 below.

Suppose now that $A_{m'}$ skips a number. Then we may find $j \in A_{m'}$ and $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $\delta_{n,j} = 0$, and (4.4) may be improved to $M \geq 1 + r^{-1}$ by using (4.3) instead of (4.2). □

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\tilde{S}(\beta)$ be as in (4.7), then $\tilde{S}(\beta) = 1$ for all $0 < \beta < 1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2, $\Lambda = 2\mathbf{Z} \cup (\frac{p}{n} + 2\mathbf{Z})$, where $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and p is an odd integer, is a spectrum for $\Omega = (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2})$. Plugging this back into (4.2) we obtain that:

$$1 = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 (\beta + k)^2} \left| e^{2\pi i \beta} - 1 \right|^2$$

for $\beta = \frac{p}{2n}$. However, the set of β of this form is dense in $\mathbf{R}$, hence by continuity the lemma holds for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$. □

5 Conclusion

Proof of Theorem 1.1. If Λ is as in Lemma 3.3*(ii)*, then Theorem 1.1*(i)* is satisfied; we may therefore assume that (3.3) holds. From Lemma 3.5 we have:

$$\Lambda - \Lambda \subset Z_1 \cup (Z_2 \cap Z_3),\ Z_2 \cap Z_3 \subset r^{-1}\mathbf{Z},\ Z_1 \subset (\lambda_* + r^{-1}\mathbf{Z}), \tag{5.1}$$

for some $\lambda_* \in \mathbf{R}$, hence $M \leq 2$. However, by Lemma 4.1 $M \geq r^{-1} \geq 2$, and this may be improved to $M \geq 3$ if one of the A_m's skips a number. Therefore we must have $r = \frac{1}{2}$ and:

$$\Lambda - \Lambda = 2\mathbf{Z} \cup (\lambda_* + 2\mathbf{Z}),\ Z_2 \cap Z_3 = 2\mathbf{Z},\ Z_1 = \lambda_* + 2\mathbf{Z}. \tag{5.2}$$

Pick $\lambda_{ij}, \lambda_{kl} \in Z_1$ such that $\lambda_{ij} - \lambda_{kl} = 2$. From the definition of Z_1 we have $\lambda_{ij}a, \lambda_{kl}a \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, hence:

$$2a = \frac{a}{r} = \lambda_{ij}a - \lambda_{kl}a \in \mathbf{Z},$$

so that $a = \frac{n}{2}$ for some $n \in \mathbf{Z}$. Finally, we have $\lambda_* a = \frac{1}{2} n \lambda_* \in \mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, hence $\lambda_* n = p$ for some odd integer p. Thus Ω and Λ satisfy *(ii)* of Theorem 1.1.

References

[1] E. M. Coven, A. Meyerowitz: *Tiling the integers with translates of one finite set*, J. Algebra **212** (1999), 161–174.

[2] B. Fuglede: *Commuting self-adjoint partial differential operators and a group theoretic problem*, J. Funct. Anal. **16** (1974), 101–121.

[3] A. Iosevich, N. H. Katz, S. Pedersen: *Fourier bases and a distance problem of Erdös*, Math. Res. Lett. **6** (1999), 251–255.

[4] A. Iosevich, N. H. Katz, T. Tao: *Convex bodies with a point of curvature do not have Fourier bases*, Amer. J. Math, to appear.

[5] A. Iosevich, N. H. Katz, T. Tao: preprint in preparation.

[6] A. Iosevich, S. Pedersen: *Spectral and tiling properties of the unit cube*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **16** (1998), 819–828.

[7] P. Jørgensen: *Spectral theory of finite volume domains in* $\mathbf{R}^n$, Adv. Math. **44** (1982), 105–120.

[8] P. Jørgensen, S. Pedersen: *Spectral theory for Borel sets in* $\mathbf{R}^n$ *of finite measure*, J. Funct. Anal. **107** (1992), 72–104.

[9] P. Jørgensen, S. Pedersen: *Spectral pairs in Cartesian coordinates*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **5** (1999), 285–302.

[10] M. Kolountzakis: *Non-symmetric convex domains have no basis of exponentials*, preprint, 1999.

[11] M. Kolountzakis: *Packing, tiling, orthogonality, and completeness*, preprint, 1999.

[12] J. C. Lagarias, J. A. Reed, Y. Wang: *Orthonormal bases of exponentials for the n-cube*, preprint, 1998.

[13] J. C. Lagarias, Y. Wang: *Tiling the line with translates of one tile*, Invent. Math. **124** (1996), 341–365.

[14] J. C. Lagarias, Y. Wang: *Spectral sets and factorizations of finite abelian groups*, J. Funct. Anal. **145** (1997), 73–98.

[15] D. J. Newman: *Tesselation of integers*, J. Number Theory **9** (1977), 107–111.

[16] S. Pedersen: *Spectral theory of commuting self-adjoint partial differential operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **73** (1987), 122–134.

[17] S. Pedersen: *Spectral sets whose spectrum is a lattice with a base*, J. Funct. Anal. **141** (1996), 496–509.

[18] R. Tijdeman: *Decomposition of the integers as a direct sum of two subsets*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol.215, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995, pp. 261–276.